

**REMARKS**

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding Final Office action mailed May 17, 2007. Claims 1, 15 and 18 have been amended. Claim 20 has been canceled. The subject matter of amended claims 1, 15 and 18 can be found in original claim 20, which was indicated as allowable. Accordingly, no new matter is added and the present application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims 1-19 and 20-26 is respectfully requested.

**I. Claim Rejections Under 35 USC § 102 – Claims 1, 2, 5, 8, 9, 13, 18 and 19**

**A. Statement of the Rejection**

Claims 1, 2, 5, 8, 9, 13, 18 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 6,515,501 to Bosnyak *et al.* (*Bosnyak*).

**B. Discussion of the Rejection**

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 18, as amended, are each patentable for at least the reason that the cited reference fails to disclose, teach, or suggest each feature in the amended claims.

It is well established that “anticipation requires the disclosure in a single prior art reference of each element of the claim under consideration.” *W.L. Gore & Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 Fed 2d 1540, 220 U.S.P.Q. 303, 313 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

Applicants’ claims 1, 15 and 18, as amended, include at least the feature indicated in the Office Action as missing from the prior art. (Office Action, item 14, page 15.) Accordingly, each feature of the claimed inventions is not disclosed in *Bosnyak*. Consequently, Applicants submit that independent claims 1, 15 and 18, as amended, are allowable over *Bosnyak* and respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1, 15 and 18 be withdrawn.

Because independent claims 1 and 18 are allowable, dependent claims 2, 5, 8, 9 and 13, which depend directly or indirectly from claim 1; and dependent claim 19, which depends directly from claim 18, are also allowable. *See In re Fine*, 837, F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 2, 5, 8, 9, 13 and 19 also be withdrawn.

## **II. Claim Rejections Under 35 USC § 103 – Claims 3, 4, 6, 7, 10-12, 14 and 21-24**

### **A. Statement of the Rejections**

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Bosnyak* in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,407,639 to Jean *et al.* (*Jean*).

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Bosnyak* in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,385,547 to Bogli *et al.* (*Bogli*).

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Bosnyak* in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,553,250 to Migayawa *et al.* (*Migayawa*).

Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Bosnyak*.

Claims 10-12 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being upatentable over *Bosnyak* in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,418,121 to Flickinger *et al.* (*Flickinger*).

Claims 15-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Bosnyak* and *Flickinger* in further view of U.S. Patent Number 6,738,415 to Drost *et al.* (*Drost*).

Claims 21-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Bosnyak* in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,498,890 to Kimminau (*Kimminau*).

Claim 25 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being upatentable over *Bosnyak* and *Kimminau* in further view of U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 20060159399 to Erdman *et al.* (*Erdman*).

Claim 26 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being upatentable over *Bosnyak* and *Flickinger* in further view of U.S. Patent Number 7,066,746 to Togami *et al.* (*Togami*).

### **B. Discussion of the Rejections**

In order for a claim to be properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103, the combined teachings of the prior art references must suggest all features of the claimed invention to one of ordinary skill in the art. *See, e.g., In Re Dow Chemical*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1529, 1531 (Fed. Cir. 1988), and *In re Keller*, 208 U.S.P.Q.2d 871, 881 (C.C.P.A. 1981). To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the prior art (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all claim features.

Applicants' independent claims 1, 15 and 18, as amended, include at least the feature indicated in the Office Action as missing from the prior art. (Office Action, item 14, page 15.) Accordingly, each feature of the claimed inventions is not disclosed in the cited prior art. Thus, dependent claim 3, which depends indirectly from claim 1 and includes all the features of claim 1, is allowable over the combination of *Bosnyak* and *Jean*. See *In re Fine, supra*. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 3 be withdrawn.

For at least the reason that each feature of independent claim 1 is not disclosed in the cited prior art, dependent claim 4, which depends indirectly from claim 1, is allowable over the combination of *Bosnyak* and *Bogli*. See *In re Fine, supra*. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 4 be withdrawn.

For at least the reason that each feature of independent claim 1 is not disclosed in the cited prior art, dependent claim 6, which depends indirectly from claim 1, is allowable over the combination of *Bosnyak* and *Migayawa*. See *In re Fine, supra*. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 6 be withdrawn.

For at least the reason that each feature of independent claim 1 is not disclosed in the cited prior art, dependent claim 7, which depends directly from claim 1, is allowable over *Bosnyak*. See *In re Fine, supra*. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 7 be withdrawn.

For at least the reason that each feature of independent claim 1 is not disclosed in the cited prior art, dependent claims 10-12 and 14, which depend directly or indirectly from claim 1, are allowable over the combination of *Bosnyak* and *Flickinger*. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 10-12 and 14 be withdrawn.

Applicants' claim 15, as amended, includes at least the feature indicated in the Office Action as missing from the prior art. (Office Action, item 14, page 15.) Accordingly, each feature of the claimed inventions is not disclosed in the combination of *Bosnyak*, *Flickinger* and *Drost*. Consequently, independent claim 15, as amended, is allowable and Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 15 be withdrawn.

Because independent claims 15, is allowable, dependent claims 16 and 17, which depend directly or indirectly from claim 15, are also allowable. See *In re Fine, supra*. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 16 and 17 also be withdrawn.

For at least the reason that each feature of independent claim 1 is not disclosed in the cited prior art, dependent claims 21-24, which depend directly or indirectly from claim 1, are

allowable over the combination of *Bosnyak* and *Kimminau*. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 21-24 be withdrawn.

For at least the reason that each feature of independent claim 1 is not disclosed in the cited prior art, dependent claim 25, which depends indirectly from claim 1, is allowable over the combination of *Bosnyak*, *Kimminau* and *Erdman*. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 25 be withdrawn.

For at least the reason that each feature of independent claim 1 is not disclosed in the cited prior art, dependent claim 26, which depends indirectly from claim 1, is allowable over the combination of *Bosnyak*, *Kimminau* and *Togami*. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 26 be withdrawn.

### **CONCLUSION**

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that pending claims 1-19 and 21-26 are allowable over the cited art of record and the present application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner have any comments regarding the Applicants' response, Applicants request that the Examiner telephone Applicants' undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

**SMITH FROHWEIN TEMPEL  
GREENLEE BLAHA LLC  
Customer No. 35856**

By: /Robert A. Blaha/  
Robert A. Blaha  
Registration No. 43,502  
(770) 709-0069